



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AF 1711 IFW

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/307,545	05/07/1999	BOYCE D. BURTS, JR.	23267/16DI	5004

7590 04/19/2005

J. M. (Mark) Gilbreth
GILBERTH & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P O BOX 2428
HOUSTON, TX 77402-2428

EXAMINER

RAJGURU, UMAKANT K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1711

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED
MAY - 9 2005
OIFE/JCWS

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/307,545

Applicant(s)

BURTS, JR., BOYCE D.

Examiner

Umakant K. Rajguru

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1711

1. A response (to non-final Office action of September 06, 2002) has been filed on September 25, 2003.
2. Claims under examination are 1-13.
3. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merrill (US 537760) in view of Messenger (US 459668) or Parsons (US 2119829) further in view of Clampitt et al. (US 3845822).

Please refer to earlier Office actions of August 22, 2002 and May 02, 2000 for this rejection.

4. Applicant's arguments filed September 25, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant admits that it is known to have the three ingredients viz polymer, crosslinking agent and reinforcing agent in a dry form to start with. What the applicant disagrees and therefore argues is that it is while a dry mixture of polymer and crosslinking agent is known in the prior art, a dry mixture of all three ingredients is unknown. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The examiner has already provided motivation to use all the three ingredients in the dry form. Additionally it is to be noted that instant claims are directed to a product and particularly to its composition i.e., the composition of an additive. The claims are not directed to a process. The applicant's arguments are directed not to a composition but to (steps in) a process. It is the patentability of the composition claimed and not of the recited steps in the process. It is the examiner's position that the product i.e., the additive of instant claims is not

Art Unit: 1711

patentably distinguishable from the one taught by prior art unless proved to be otherwise by the applicant.

As regards claims 11-13 which are directed to a process, the examiner is of the option that it is obvious to use any two or all three components in dry form, mix them and then add the solvent or water to the dry blend. Using a blend ^{of} ~~all~~ all three components in dry form is an obvious variation of the teachings of prior art and does not qualify for any patentability.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to U. K. Rajguru whose telephone number is (571) 272-1077. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 am to 6:00 pm.

Art Unit: 1711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


U. K. Rajguru/af
April 18, 2005


James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700